

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further examination are requested.

I. Amendments to the Claims

Claim 19 has been amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection discussed in detail below. Further, claims 19-22 have been amended to further distinguish the claimed invention from the references relied upon in the rejections discussed below. Support for these amendments can be found in, at least, paragraphs [0051] and [0073] and Fig. 10 of the present application.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection

Claims 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for failing to recite statutory subject matter. Specifically, claim 19 was rejected for failing to recite any specific type of hardware, such that the limitations of claim 19 can be interpreted as software alone.

Claim 19 has been amended to include a processor. As a result, claim 19 now requires more than software alone. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection

Claims 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Hourvitz and Cache Replacement Algorithms (non-patent literature). This rejection is believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 19 and 22 and the claims that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Independent claim 19 recites an apparatus for controlling a screen resource that is required to display a screen on a display. Further, claim 19 recites that the apparatus includes an instruction section receiving an instruction to switch a screen currently displayed on the display to another screen. Finally, claim 19 recites that the apparatus includes a screen control section for, when (i) it is determined that the currently displayed screen is completely hidden by the another screen, and (ii) an attribute of the currently displayed screen indicates that the currently displayed screen is in a resident state indicating that the screen resource of the currently displayed screen is to invariably remain in a generated state, displaying the another screen on the display without discarding the screen resource of the currently displayed screen.

As a result of the structure required by claim 19, the claimed apparatus can keep a resource of a screen to be hidden from being discarded, by setting the attribute of the screen to be hidden to indicate the resident state, when it is known in advance that the resource of the screen to be hidden should remain in the generated state (i.e., “an attribute of the currently displayed screen indicates that the currently displayed screen is in a resident state indicating that the screen resource of the currently displayed screen is to invariably remain in a generated state, displaying the another screen on the display without discarding the screen resource of the currently displayed screen,” as recited in claim 19), which in turn makes it possible to improve screen display speed.

Hourvitz and Cache Replacement, or any combination thereof, fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features and the result of the structure as recited in independent claim 19.

Rather, Hourvitz merely teaches a retained window scheme, wherein, when a writing to a non-visible obscured region 18 is performed, the non-visible obscured region is always drawn

into a buffer 19 (see col. 2, lines 13-33, and Fig. 3). In addition, Hourvitz teaches that this above-described retained window scheme is utilized when window A is partially obscured by window B, such that window A includes the non-visible obscured region 18 and a visible region 17 (see col. 2, lines 13-33, and Fig. 3).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Hourvitz teaches that the non-visible region of the window is always saved into a buffer, but fails to disclose or suggest that when (i) it is determined that the currently displayed screen is completely hidden by the another screen, and (ii) an attribute of the currently displayed screen indicates that the currently displayed screen is in a resident state indicating that the screen resource of the currently displayed screen is to invariably remain in a generated state, displaying the another screen on the display without discarding the screen resource of the currently displayed screen, as required by claim 19.

In other words, according to Hourvitz, the screen resource is not discarded, but is always stored in the buffer regardless of the state of the window having the non-visible portion, whereas claim 19 requires a determination to be made of whether the attribute of the currently displayed screen indicates that the currently displayed screen is in a resident state indicating that the screen resource of the currently displayed screen is to invariably remain in a generated state, in order for the screen control section to display the another screen without discarding the screen resource of the currently displayed screen.

Specifically, Hourvitz does not disclose or suggest determining whether or not the attribute of the currently displayed screen indicates that the currently displayed screen is in a resident state indicating that the screen resource of the currently displayed screen is to invariably remain in a generated state, as recited in claim 19, because Hourvitz teaches that the screen resource is always saved in the buffer.

Additionally, Applicants note that Hourvitz teaches that this above-described retained window scheme is utilized when window A is partially obscured by window B, such that window A includes the non-visible obscured region 18 and a visible region 17, but fails to disclose or suggest that, when it is determined that the currently displayed screen is completely hidden by the another screen and when the attribute of the currently displayed screen satisfies certain conditions, the screen control section displays the another screen without discarding the screen resource of the currently displayed screen, as required by claim 19.

Now turning to Cache Replacement, the Applicants note that Cache Replacement was relied upon for teaching the use of a least frequently used cache algorithm (see page 61). However, as evidenced from the claim amendments above, claim 19 has been amended to replace the limitation related to the high frequency of display, with a limitation directed to the attribute of the currently displayed screen indicating that the currently displayed screen is in a resident state indicating that the screen resource of the currently displayed screen is to invariably remain in a generated state, which is a limitation that is not disclosed or suggested by Cache Replacement.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that claim 19 and claims 20 and 21 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Hourvitz and Cache Replacement.

Additionally, Applicants note that in light of the discussion above, the combination of Hourvitz and Cache Replacement does not provide the above-mentioned benefits of the structure required by claim 19, such that the claimed apparatus can keep a resource of a screen to be hidden from being discarded, by setting the attribute of the screen to be hidden to indicate the

resident state, when it is known in advance that the resource of the screen to be hidden should remain in the generated state, which in turn makes it possible to improve screen display speed.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Hourvitz and/or Cache Replacement or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Hourvitz and/or Cache Replacement to obtain the invention of independent claim

19. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 19 and claims 20 and 21 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claim 22 is directed to a method and recites features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 19. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 22 is allowable over any combination of Hourvitz and Cache Replacement.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Ken YAMASHITA et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By 2009.09.23 15:14:23 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
September 23, 2009